



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,660	09/30/2003	Timothy M. Simon	CHOND.65023	5821
22859 7590 12/26/2007 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A. 200 SOUTH SIXTH STREET SUITE 4000 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			EXAMINER WILLSE, DAVID H	
			ART UNIT 3738	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/26/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/675,660

Applicant(s)

SIMON ET AL.

Examiner

Dave Willse

Art Unit

3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12 and 16-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12 and 16-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12, 16, 18, 21, 22, and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Stone et al., US 5,306,311, which discloses a cartilage plug **10** having a lubricious surface (column 7, lines 49-53) and a plurality of ridges **14** concentric about axis **11** (column 6, lines 3-5; column 18, lines 4-6) to thereby define respective parallel planes substantially perpendicular to said axis (Figure 4A). Regarding claim 16, matrix **12** has a cylindrical shape. Regarding claim 24 and others, the plurality of ridges **14** can take the form of a single helix about central axis **11** (column 6, lines 5-8; column 9, lines 48-51); the plug **10** is formed of laminated materials of different hardness (column 10, lines 16-34; Table 1; etc.). Regarding claim 25 and others: column 3, lines 15-17.

Claims 15, 17, 19, 20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone et al., US 5,306,311. Regarding claims 15 and 20, discontinuous ridges with a barb shaped cross-section would have been an obvious modification to the ordinary practitioner in order to facilitate self-tapping and locking into the bone, with further motivation having been provided by the paragraph at column 6, lines 3-16. Regarding claim 17, a polyhedral shape

would have been obvious in order to better resist torsion. Regarding claim 23, the bores **126** having ridges therein would have been obvious so as to enhance the interlocking of the fibers forced into said bores (column 10, lines 22-24).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US 6,120,541: drawings; column 1, lines 46-55; column 2, lines 4-15.

The Applicant's remarks have been considered. The Applicant argues that the outermost periphery of the Stone et al. device **10** (Figure 4A) must be the smooth outer surface not having any ridges (Applicant's reply of October 16, 2007: page 6, lines 11-17). As noted in the Office action of April 16, 2007, the terms "outermost" and "periphery" can be interpreted quite broadly, particularly in the absence of any defining language in the amended claims. Moreover, the Applicant's apparent interpretation of "outermost periphery" is inconsistent with the Applicant's own claimed invention, which encompasses most or all of the ridges being formed outwardly of a periphery (or peripheries) not the most distant from the central axis, as evidenced by the Applicant's claim 19.


All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE**

Application/Control Number:
10/675,660
Art Unit: 3738

Page 4

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Willse, whose telephone number is 571-272-4762 and who is generally available Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Dave Willse
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3738